

Appl. No.: 10/519,317  
Reply to Office Action of: 04/05/2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2006

REMARKS

In regard to section 1 or the office action, the examiner is incorrect. The application and drawings are supplied by WIPO directly to the USPTO. Applicants' attorney merely supplied a copy for the convenience of the USPTO.

In regard to section 2 of the office action, the examiner is requested to reconsider his objection. The figures clearly show a projection (83 and 112), and a corresponding housing or opening (84, 114). The features claimed in claim 16 are shown in the drawings.

In regard to section 3 of the office action, the abstract has been amended above.

In regard to section 4 of the office action, the claims have been amended above to overcome the examiner's objections.

In regard to section 5 of the office action, the specification has been amended above to overcome the examiner's objection.

Claim 7 has been converted from dependent form into independent form, but not with all of the limitations of the intervening dependent claims. This change in form does not narrow or limit the scope of the claim. The independent claim which claim 7 was formerly dependent upon has not been cancelled. Therefore, the full scope of the doctrine of equivalents should apply to claim 7 as if it was originally presented in independent form when the application was filed. In view of paragraph 10 of the office action, claim 7 should be in condition for allowance.

Appl. No.: 10/519,317  
Reply to Office Action of: 04/05/2006

Claims 1, 8, 10-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts (US 6,074,220). Claims 1, 11, 12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hamlin (US 5,730,619). Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated Wilson (US 3,629,787). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Claim 1 claims that the connection device is adapted to removably plug the support with the flex circuit into a receiving slot of another member. The cited references do not disclose or suggest a connection device which is adapted to removably plug into a receiving slot of another member. For example, in Roberts there is a "one part" system that is permanently fixed on a PCB. Connecting consists in opening the spring assembly 8, then introducing the naked flex cable into the unique connector part, and closing the spring 8. In applicants' embodiment the flex is permanently fixed in a first half-connector. Connecting consists in bringing this first half-connector into/on "some" second half-connector, for example as in Fig 7. Drawback of Roberts are: a) the naked flex end is unprotected when not connected, and b) the handling/connecting of naked flex is much more difficult than that of a bigger connector part. In narrow places (e.g. a motor) it might be quite impossible.

The features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Appl. No.: 10/519,317  
Reply to Office Action of: 04/05/2006

Though dependent claims 2-6 and 8-17 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 18 has been added above to claim the features recited therein.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 7/5/06  
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683  
Harrington & Smith, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
203-925-9400

• CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

July 5 2006  
Date

Dale Pongatti  
Name of Person Making Deposit